


This is ACHERON, the official journal of the National Fantasy Fan Federation Games Bureau Diplomacy Division. It appears at irregular intervals. It is free to Members of the Division, 10/\$1 to members of the Bureau, and 10/\$1.50 to others. This is Pandemonium Publication #364, edited and published by Rod Walker, 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego CA 92116. Bureau Chairman: Don Miller. Division Chief (also ACHERON Editor. Orphan Games Director, and PONTEVEDRIA Editor): Rod Walker. Archives Director: Walt Buchanan. Orphan Variant Games Director: P. M. Gaylord. U.S. Data Director: Tony Pandin. United Kingdom Data Director: Hartley Patterson. Ratings Director & DIPLOGROK Editor: Gary Jones.



DIVISION CHIEF RESIGNS

Postal Diplomacy is never going to advance if the same people always run everything, or if all power is concentrated in the hands of a few people. When I resigned earlier this year, I had hoped that new faces would come forward and it would not be necessary for me to run for reelection. No one came forward and I ran unopposed. Since then, however, I have been searching for a replacement. I have been successful.

My reasons for resigning are several:

1. My time is becoming more severely limited. Insofar as I can, I wish to concentrate on my roles as Gamesmaster, publisher, and bibliophile, for I can best serve postal Diplomacy here. As the new school year begins, I am not going to have the free time I have had this past year. If this job is to be done at all, it must be done by someone else.

2. The concentration of authority in my hands is too damn much. I edit a moderately influential Diplomacy 'zine. I assign Boardman Numbers. I keep standard records on regular games. I run the Diplomacy Division. I edit three official 'zines: ACHERON, GEHENNA, and PONTEVEDRIA. And so on. In contrast to those who shamelessly concentrate power in their own hands in a frantic desire to run everything, I am alarmed at the bunch I've accumulated over the years.

3. I strongly feel that new faces and new ideas are needed at the top. They are the ones with the time and enthusiasm to do the good jobs we need. We also need people who are not interested in self-serving adulation and do not desire to "buy" postal Diplomacy by saying "I do all the work" or "I pay all the bills".

Therefore, I am acting decisively to divest myself of some of my positions and workload. I am acting to distribute this among new people who are capable of doing the work. My resignation, accepted by Bureau Chairman Don Miller, is effective 1 September 1971 and it is irrevocable. In the interim, I will straighten up some paperwork and draft a Basic Document (not a Constitution) governing the Division.

The new Division Chief, appointed by the Bureau Chairman at my request, is Tony Pandin, 10406 Shaker Blvd., Cleveland OH 44104. His appointment is on the following conditions: if, by Wednesday, 1 September 1971, no other member of the Division expresses a desire to be Division Chief, Tony's appointment is permanent, to serve out the unexpired portion of my term (to 31 May 1973). If one or more persons come forward by 1 September, we will have an election, and Tony will serve as ad interim Chief. Members may not nominate other persons, they must nominate themselves.

In addition, Tony will be ACHERON Editor (or appoint another) and I will find a new Orphan Games Director (any volunteers?). More on the details of the transfer in #10.

MEMBERSHIP. Active Members: Perry Andrus, Jim Barber, Doug Beyerlein, Lee Childs, Walt Buchanan, Allan Calhamer, Ray Bowers, P. M. Gaylord, Gary Gygax, Ted Holcombe, Bob Johnson, Gary Jones, Axel Krigsman, Len Lakofka, Dave Lebling, Harry Manogg, Steve Marsland, John Mensinger, Don Miller, Hal Naus, Hartley Patterson, Larry Peery, Lewis Pulispher, Paul Rubin, Larry St.Cyr, John Smythe, Mehran Thomson, Buddy Tretick, Don Turnbull, Conrad vonMetzke, Rod Walker, Bob Ward, Greg Warden, Charles Welsh. (34)

Active, but does not yet paid: Eric Just, Jeff Key, Bob VanAndel, Tony Pandin. (4).

Status uncertain: Charles Reinsel, Doug Schaefer. (2).

Resigned: Ken Borecki (will soon cease publication of ROHAN), John McCallum (does not desire to belong to any organization), Christ Schleicher ("the feud"), Charles Wells (withdrawn from most postal Diplomacy activity).

Dropped: Mike Childers (inactivity), Dave Lindsay (inactivity).

If there is room this issue, an address list will be printed at the end. If not, I will provide any addresses requested by a member and publish the address list later.

ELECTION '71. Bureau Chairman Miller has now certified to me the names of those members voting in the last election: Andrus, Barber, Borecki, Bowers, Buchanan, Beyerlein, Childs, Gaylord, Holcombe, Johnson, Key, Krigsman, Lakofka, Lebling, Mensinger, Miller, Naus, Peery, Schaefer, St.Cyr, Turnbull, VanAndel, Walker, Warden.

BALLOT RESULTS. We had 32 ballots returned, as follows: Andrus, Barber, Beyerlein, Buchanan, Calhamer, Gaylord, Gygax, Holcombe, Johnson, Jones, Just, Key, Krigsman, Lakofka, Lebling, Manogg, Mensinger, Miller, Naus, Patterson, Peery, Pulsipher, St.Cyr, Smythe, Turnbull, VanAndel, vonMetzke, Walker, Ward, Warden, Welsh.

Failing to submit ballots (among the 34 active members): Childs, Bowers, Marsland, Rubin, Thomson, Tretick.

Item 1. WAZIR

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ab.</u>	
18	10	4	Shall the Diplomacy Division recommend to the Board of Directors of the Diplomacy Association that the Association's official organ, WAZIR, be made available to non-members (of the DA) on a subscription basis?

Item 2. Membership

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ab.</u>	
18	9	5	Shall members of the Board of Directors of the Diplomacy Association (plus the Editor of WAZIR, if not a DA Board member) be eligible for membership in the Diplomacy Division by virtue of their positions?

Item 3. Secret Ballot

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Ab.</u>	
7	19	6	When the question noted in Item 4 is voted upon, shall the Division Chief publish the roll of those who voted and the way in which each cast his ballot?

DIVISION ACTION

1 & 2: On 24 July 1971, when the result of the vote was clear, the Division Chief prepared ACHERON SUPPLEMENT 1 and sent it to all members of the DA Board of Directors. It invited them to join the Division, explained what the Division was, and indicated our desire to have WAZIR made available by subscription. None of the Board members has yet responded, although Chairman Beshara, in a typical attack of paranoia, labeled the document an "attack". Uh-huh, sure, John-baby. Anyway, a copy of the SUPPLEMENT is free to any member of the Division who requests one.

Admittedly, asking Chairman Beshara and Dick Miller to join is a bit like asking Edgar Bergan and Charlie McCarthy. Since neither was likely to accept the invitation in the spirit in which it was offered (since, to them, an "invitation" is an "attack"), I decided to enjoy issuing the invite to Miller. His was accompanied by the following letter:

"Greetings from the Most High:

"In the midst of seducing virgins, autographing stone tablets, raining fire and brimstone on my enemies, and other things us deities do all the time, I thought I'd drop a note to explain the enclosed.

"Knowing that one of your hobbies is misinterpreting, under the guidance of John Beshara, everything you read, I wish to point out that there is no connection between the two enclosures you will find here, other than the fact that they have come out at about the same time.

"One is an invitation of join the Diplomacy Division. I don't really believe you will accept, since John will tell you not to, which is probably just as well. I prefer members who think for themselves. Notwithstanding, the invitation is issued at the behest of the Division, who voted to extend it, and you may accept if John wants to.

"The other item is an editorial from the latest EREHWON [50]. Naturally, your present equipage (blinders and a snaffle bit) will not allow you to take it at face value, and John will no doubt hand you many interesting misinterpretations. Copies have gone to all the members of the Board, of course. I have not sent a copy to John because sending you anything is the same as sending him the same thing, so when you go running to him to find out what to do, please be sure to take all of this along.

"Sincerely,

/s/

"god

"Head Deity: Virgins deflowered, people chosen, water into wine, fish and ~~leaves~~ chips, reasonable rates."

Needless to say, Miller did go running to Beshara, who has been sending copies of this letter to various people, apparently hoping they would get the same chuckle from it that those to whom I sent it got.

3. Subsequent to this vote, Len Lakofka has withdrawn item 4, the censure of John Beshara. The proposal of the item itself has provoked many interesting comments from our members, and I want to thank Len for giving us the opportunity to discuss this question. I am now quoting from the ballots which have comments:

LEE CHILDS. I feel that the problems created by John Beshara's actions are of a private nature, and hence, not subject to a group action. This is a man-to-man thing, not a group-against-group thing.

TED HOLCOMBE. I think diplomacy feuds should be censured, but censuring John Beshara for "feuding" is only going to be a continuation of a feud and hence any such censuring should be censured. On the other hand, if John Beshara is guilty of misstating facts or of unethical Diplomacy practice (but such a line of argument has not been proposed), a censure would be appropriate.

BOB JOHNSON. I don't think we should censure J.B. I understood the censuring was to be mainly for exceeding bad GMs--not unhappy players. Besides, if Walker's group censures J.B., J.B.'s group will censure Walker and this no longer funny feud further creates division. Let the time pass J.B. away. See attached letter to editor of WAZIR. [Portions quoted in ERE. 50.]

LEN LAKOFKA. I've written enough on this subject, so my position is clear. John Beshara is a self-centered paranoic who cannot accept either fun, just criticism, or discussion anti his position. Once initiated a discussion that disagrees with John ceases, because the man refuses to reply to you. I suggest John lock himself in his Ivory Tower and swallow the key.

DAVE LEELENG. If one player can publish things which offend another to the extent that Mr. Beshara has been offended, he certainly has the right of reply, which it is his privilege to abuse as he sees fit. The GB should not get involved beyond (at the most) recommending that both of the antagonists cease and desist. Personal vendettas, which disputes of this type often degenerate to, ruined many S.F. organizations, including perhaps the N3F itself. Shall we let them ruin Postal Diplomacy? Face the facts, hard as they are: the GB and the DA certainly have not got either the power or the prestige to waste on trying to referee personal squabbles, the identity and magnificence of the squabblers notwithstanding. There are more important things to concern ourselves with. Further, any action by the GB, no matter who actually initiates it, can be interpreted as an action of its Director, who is unfortunately one of the parties to the dispute. Thus anything we do can only personalize the argument, perhaps to a degree dangerous to both organizations (now, at least, only peripherally involved). [Read "DD" for "GB"--Ed.]

JOHN MENSINGER. I don't think it is the part of this or any organization to censure somebody, thus getting involved in a personal feud. Also, in this specific case, such a censure will be construed as a censure against the DA. This censure would only contribute to this feud, and widen a split between the DD and the DA. Let us not judge and chastize any parties in this feud, but rather let us do our best to try to understand the reasons for it, not to become part of it, and try to end the damn thing.

DON MILLER. I believe that organizations such as the GBDD and the DA should stay completely out of all feuds and squabbles between individuals (as organizations; individuals are free to do what they like). The only time either organization could conceivably be justified in speaking out against any individual would be when that individual's actions were so detrimental to the Diplomacy world at large that to remain silent would itself be harmful (e.g., in a case where a GM was defrauding players by announcing games, taking money, and then folding the games and refusing to refund the money). If any one wishes to present a censure motion for consideration, he should document his charges in detail, showing where and how the field has been harmed by the individual/organization in question. I believe it would then be prudent for the group to vote on whether or not grounds for a censure vote were present before taking an actual vote on censure. (I know this sounds like voting on virtually the same thing twice, but think about it....)[The Grand Jury system operates in exactly this fashion.--Ed.] A lot of potential unpleasantness could be avoided this way (as well as providing a "cooling-off period" before censure vote is taken).

HARTLEY PATTERSON. I have seen GRAUSTARK 238, and the remarks there did seem rather a waste of space. However, since I know nothing of the background to this affair, plainly it is not for me to comment directly on it, let alone vote. Feuding seems to be a carry-over from SF fandom, where it is virtually a way of life for some. It may be very useless art for some individuals, but generally the SF world is big enough to contain such running battles. Besides, with 2-3 months between fanzines there's a chance for things to cool off. Postal Diplomacy, however, is different. It's smaller, which means that in a big feud everyone has a chance to "take sides". With

'zines appearing ever 2-4 weeks the combatants can be kept "on the boil". Item 3, if carried, would be a mistake. Anyone voting one side or the other can then be labelled as being on one side or the other of the feud. Even if the voting is secret, it will be an opportunity to turn a feud between two individuals into a rift between the two organizations--particularly if the DA chose not to take any action against Mr. Beshara.

If the vote could be worded so as to avoid the taking of sides, I think it would possibly do some good: "The Diplomacy Division considers the current feud involving Rod Walker and John Beshara in GRAUSTARK has become damaging to postal Diplomacy as a whole by virtue of their official positions. This feud should not be continued, at least not at such a level of abuse." If a vote of censure does go ahead it should be made clear that it is one article we are referring to, not the DA, the feud, or any other matter. "The Diplomacy Division has passed a vote of censure on John Beshara for his intemperate remarks in GRAUSTARK 238. Such vulgar attacks by any player, for whatever reason, cannot be condoned."

LARRY PEERY. I do not approve of using this organization as a vehicle of attack against John Beshara, the head of TDA. This is precisely the type of inter-organizational feuding I'm trying to avoid. If some members of this organization wish to express themselves collectively and deem it necessary to censure John for his remarks, so be it. However, considering what I've read printed by both people I cannot honestly say that either of them is more open to censure than the other. If anything I would be inclined to favor a statement demanding that both cease and desist from any and all attacks on the other. And that is censorship!

JOHN SMYTHE. Each in his own way, John Beshara and Rod Walker have informed the world of Diplomacy of their respective positions in their now infamous squabble. Assuming that the world of Diplomacy is thoroughly capable of judging for itself the merits of each position, there is no need for public censure of John Beshara, or Rod Walker for that matter. Furthermore, it is my belief that Diplomacy associations exist to provide for the needs of Diplomacy players. I do not believe that these needs are best served by involving the associations in personal squabbles that should never have been made public. What I would like to see is a vote taken on whether private parties should be permitted to air their personal grievances in association 'zines. Any takers?

BOB VAN ANDEL. It is improper to ask whether John Beshara should be censured by the Diplomacy Division....On page one of ACHERON 8 it is lamented that an individual is interfering with the operation of the DD, of which this unnamed person is not a member. In the light of this, it seems a bit ludicrous and even underhanded to initiate "censure" (whatever meanings or connotations are given) proceedings against an individual who is not a member of the censuring body. The Senate of the United States does not censure private citizens or members of the House of Representatives, nor do they have the power to do so. A more proper question for consideration of the Senators of Diplomacy would be, "Shall we as a group of leading personages express disapproval of the actions of John Beshara in GRAUSTARK 238?" This is not a mere quibbling over meaning and connotation. For any group to undertake to force a course of action or do anything but express an opinion towards someone who is not a member of that group is criminal irresponsibility. [However, Bob, "censure" in the Senate and "censure" here do in fact mean very different things. It does mean disapproval, although very strong disapproval. In terms of practical results, what is the difference between saying "censure" and saying "disapproval"?--Ed.]

ROD WALKER. While the GRAUSTARK 238 article was puerile at best, there may be problems in censuring. For one thing, we may be using a club to beat up a mosquito. If John is guilty of something censurable in this feud, I would pick his use of WAZIR as a vehicle. There is also the danger of involving our two organizations directly. That is, of involving the DD with the DA. The DA, totally controlled by Beshara, is already feuding with us. This has been true from the beginning: a player, not a member of the DD, writes that much of the hush-hush meeting at which the DA was founded was given over to a tirade by John Boardman against the Division. Since then, Beshara and Boardman have continued to attack and denigrate the Division at every available opportunity. So far the Division has stepped back from the morass in which the DA is wallowing and perhaps we should keep it that way. Notwithstanding, I agree with Len's contentions about the character of Beshara's article, but my opinion is hardly unbiased.

BOB WARD. John's remarks were immature, intemperate, ill-considered, and hardly contributory to the debate. However, the debate itself was over a relatively minor matter. I have never understood what all the excitement was about. Given the inflamed emotions of the two sides, and recognizing that a wise man stays out of others' feuds, I would vote "NO" even though, as expressed in the first sentence, I can hardly support the position taken by John.

CHARLES WELSH. No, I feel the best way to handle Beshara is to ignore him. I suspect that would bother him the most.

[I want to thank you for your comments. It may be, under new management, ACHERON can expand this section devoted to statements by members. It is the first time we have done this, and it worked out pretty well.

[Bob Ward asks why we don't have a section on each ballot on whether or not a vote should be printed out. The reason is that I believe nobody would be interested in the roll call on most issue, just on the controversial ones. On those questions, I find out whether the vote should be printed or not; the result is invariably "no", so far. On other issues, if I were requested to print the roll of votes, I would put that to a vote, although I doubt most people would care about whether or not their vote was printed out on issues such as, e.g., dues. It's the sensitive issues that are of primary concern here.]

DIVISION NAME. "NFFFCB Diplomacy Division" is a clumsy title, but necessary, since "Division" begs the question, "Division of what?" Further, the title really says very little about us in terms of what we are or what we do. I have long thought that perhaps one day we would do something about our name, making it more descriptive. Does anyone out there have any ideas on a better name for the group? If so, we'll compile a list of the suggestions, discuss them, and put up the more popular ones for a vote.

APPOINTMENTS. By virtue of the power vested in me as Division Chief, I have appointed: P.M. Gaylord as Orphan Variant Games Director. Mr. Gaylord will be doing for variants what I have been doing for regular games. Because of similar interests, Lewis Pulsipher will also be working on this project. Already in the works: the McDuffie variants in THANGORODRIM.

I have also appointed Tony Pandin as U.S. Data Director. Mr. Pandin will be working on compiling all data for completed games in one place, under such circumstances that it will be easily accessible for anyone who needs it (for a rating system, e.g.).

REPORTS OF OUR DIRECTORATES. The various Directorates of the Division are autonomous, self-contained bodies. Some would continue with or without our sponsorship but were officially conceived and begun within our group. Each Director is his own boss, acting on his own in our name. He is responsible to the Division Chief for productive and circumspect performance, but he makes his own policy.

ARCHIVES. Walt Buchanan is making splendid strides with this project. Already he has been of immeasurable help in aiding others to round out their collections, in publishing valuable materials in his HOOSIER ARCHIVES, and in many other ways. Walt is typical of a new wave of Diplomacy players who are enthusiastic and unselfish in their service to the hobby. Walt has ~~sought no adulation or self-service in his actions, and since virtue is its~~ own reward, is becoming known as the publisher of the best, most interesting, most useful Diplomacy zine in the business.

DIPLOGROK. This has met with tragedy yet again. The full set of masters for #1 were stolen from the mails between Tennessee and California, the empty envelope turning up in Colorado. The entire issue will have to be reconstructed, which we hope to do shortly. However, in the process of moving from Gallatin to Memphis, Gary Jones' entire Diplomacy collection and files vanished. This situation is complicated by John Beshara's threat to Gary that he would hound him publically for failure to publish. This unfair and ungenerous attitude only makes getting DIPLOGROK back on the road more difficult. However, I am helping Gary reconstruct his files and will obtain more help for him at DipCon IV. Any offers of assistance will be gratefully appreciated.

ORPHAN REGULAR GAMES. Although LA GUERRE seems to be publishing again, some of its games are still not appearing and we are working on this. In addition, INTERNATIONAL ENQUIRER is still in limbo, and we are working with the new Editor/GM, Harry Manogg, to see about getting IEs overripe games off the books (most of the players seem to have disappeared) or restarted. THE VOICE, whose transfer temporarily to Andrew Phillips was thought to have been arranged, has still made no progress and Andy has (I gather) heard nothing. LEGATUS is now under way again, under the temporary stewardship of Tony Pandin. The LONELY MOUNTAIN games are apparently all going to be cancelled, due to lack of player interest. Records for 1969H, which is over, have yet to be obtained.

PONTEVEDRIA. Issue #5 is now out, with an up-to-date listing of game openings. Inquiries have slowed down to about 2 or 3 a week.

I encourage all our members: if you have a project for us to accomplish, write me about it. If you want to do the work, then I can usually give you our backing on the spot, for any general service, worthwhile project. If it will involve money from the Division, or involves the enunciation of a new policy, it will have to be voted on first. The more projects we undertake, the more use we can be to postal Diplomacy.

NEW RULEBOOK. It will soon be published, as I note in EREHWON 52. In response to an inquiry from me, John Moot, President of GRI, states that he should be able to provide copies free to postal GMs who wish them. This is not finalized yet, so please watch EREHWON and ACHERON for further word. My article in EREHWON 52 summarizes the new Rules, insofar as they are known to me, including their surprising new feature: a victory criterion of 18 centers.

DIPCON V AND BEYOND. DipCon V, to be held in 1972, will be at a site which is yet to be determined. Seattle had expressed an interest as early

as 1970, through Doug Beyerlein. This interest may or may not have continued. Chicago is also interested.

What we need is some orderly and equitable way of choosing the site of each annual Diplomacy Convention. DipCons I and II were ad hoc affairs at John Koning's house in Ohio. DipCons III and IV were (or are to be) held in Oklahoma City and San Diego by general consent. But we are rapidly approaching the time when several sites will want it and other disagreements on nomenclature, timing, and so on will develop. We should have a way of settling these questions, so that the site of each annual DipCon is clearly and unequivocally known to all, and that the site will not be in one given area of the country too often.

At DipCon IV I am going to propose an ad hoc committee representing various areas of the country and various interested groups be selected to settle on the site of DipCon V. I am also going to propose an independent, unaffiliated, representative, and self-perpetuating group which will make all future selections.

The idea is not to benefit any one group or area. It is not at all important who gets the nod in a given year; what is important is that the decision is made authoritatively and equitably.

How should such a group be constituted? If you have ideas on this, please send them to me before the 28th, if you can. There will be many different types of opinion represented at the DipCon, and I expect we will come up with a good solution to the problem. But the more suggestions we have to work with, the better.

NEXT ISSUE will be co-edited by Tony Pandin and myself. That will be the issue in which I transfer the Division to him, either permanently or ad interim. In it, Tony will (I hope) have an article on his thoughts on the Division and I will do some rambling on philosophy and whatnot. Attached will be, hopefully, our "basic document" on how this thing operates. There will also be a complete financial statement of our income and expenses for this membership year (1 June 1971 to date). I am sure Tony will welcome, as I will, any thoughts you have on the future of the Division as the "Kiwaniis" of postal Diplomacy.

There is no ballot attached to this issue since there are no questions up for a vote. If you have any questions you wish to have a vote on, pass them on to me, please. Try to make your idea as clear and precise as possible. I will work with you in making it ready for presentation so that the question being voted on is exactly what you mean--with this caveat, that the Division Chief's power here is discretionary, at least to the point of not accepting questions for vote which would expand the work expected of him beyond his capacity to discharge his function.

****Note on the DipCon item above.** All of my proposals are being made as a private individual, not on behalf of the Division. However, I want you to know what I'm doing, in case you would like to make suggestions.

And that would seem to terminate this issue.

30

Late Note: Peter Ansoff, editor of the excellent Hypereconomic 'zine THE SYBERIAN, has just joined the Division. Welcome, Peter!

And Eric Just's dues are now paid. As you can guess, the mail just came in.